

Appl. No. 11/712,239
Docket No. 9103M
Amdt. dated January 16, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed on October 16, 2007
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1 - 11 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claim 1 has been amended to claim that the nonwoven substrate retains its thickness when wet. Support for the amendment is provided at page 3, lines 1-3. Claim 10 has been amended to claim the thickness of the wet wipe is at least about 30% greater than the thickness of a wet textured wet wipe which does not include protruding elements locked by a reinforcing means. Support for this amendment is provided at page 3, lines 10-13.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over DOBRIN et al. (US 6,383,431 B1) in view of Smith (US 3,616,157)

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over DOBRIN (US 6,383,431) in view of SMITH (US 3,616,157). This rejection was addressed in the response to the previous Office Actions. Although the latest Office Action asserts that the arguments presented therein were not persuasive, Applicant continues to aver the point of view presented in the previous response and traverses the additional arguments presented in the most recent Office Action.

According to the recent Office Action, SMITH teaches that the embossed areas should be adhesively bonded in order to provide the article with increased shape stability. In addition, the Office Action states that the Applicant's allegation that the second layer of DOBRIN serves as reinforcement for the embossed areas is without merit or support in the disclosure of DOBRIN.

First, contrary to the Office Action, SMITH does not teach adhesively bonding the embossed areas to provide the article with increased shape stability. In fact, Column 3, lines 31-36, of SMITH teaches that the compacted areas 22 and 24 form a pattern of intermittently spaced, separate and discrete, embossed, compacted fibrous areas which lie

Appl. No. 11/712,239
Docket No. 9103M
Amdt. dated January 16, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed on October 16, 2007
Customer No. 27752

in the planes of the substantially parallel top and bottom surfaces of the nonwoven fabric, whereas the unembossed, uncompacted portions 28, 30 lie between these planes and hingedly connect the embossed, compacted areas. Thus, the compacted areas of SMITH are hingedly connected and therefore, do not result in locked protruding elements as claimed.

Second, although DOBRIN does not explicitly disclose that a second film layer forming a laminate with the textured nonwoven serves as a reinforcement to the protruded elements formed, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that attaching the nonwoven to a film restrains the nonwoven in the x-y plane which has the effect of maintaining the texture formed in the nonwoven


Further, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 per this response to emphasize that the nonwoven substrate (claim 1) and the wet wipe (claim 10) retain their thickness when wet. Neither DOBRIN, SMITH nor the combination teaches or suggests this benefit. Consequently, for this reason and the reasons presented above as well as those presented in the previous responses, the combination of DOBRIN and SMITH does not teach all of the claim limitations of claims 1-11.

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of claims 1-11 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By 
Signature
Jay A. Krebs

Typed or Printed Name
Registration No. 41,914
(513) 634-9959

Date: January 16, 2008
Customer No. 27752